

Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clayton
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Coyne
Cramer
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)

Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klecicka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pascarell
Paul
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts

Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sánchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velázquez
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wilson

Wise
Wolf

Woolsey
Wu

Wynn
Young (FL)

NAYS—68

Aderholt
Baird
Becerra
Bilbray
Blagojevich
Borski
Brady (PA)
Capuano
Clay
Clyburn
Costello
Crane
Crowley
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dickey
Dingell
Doggett
Etheridge
Fisher
Ford
Frost
Gibbons

Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchev
Holt
Hooley
Jones (OH)
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Levin
LoBiondo
McDermott
McNulty
Moore
Moran (KS)
Oberstar
Pallone
Pastor

Payne
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pombo
Ramstad
Riley
Sabo
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Weller

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tancred

NOT VOTING—24

Abercrombie
Boucher
Brown (OH)
Chenoweth-Hage
Conyers
Cox
Delahunt
Dixon

English
Gephardt
Hansen
Hutchinson
LaTourette
Markey
McCrery
McKinney

Meeks (NY)
Norwood
Rogan
Salmon
Scarborough
Waxman
Wicker
Young (AK)

□ 1057

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1100

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 2990, QUALITY CARE FOR
THE UNINSURED ACT OF 1999,
AND H.R. 2723, BIPARTISAN CON-
SENSUS MANAGED CARE IM-
PROVEMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 323 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 323

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2990) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals greater access to health insurance through a health care tax deduction, a long-term care deduction, and other health-related tax incentives, to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide access to and choice in health care through association health plans, to amend the Public Health Service Act to create new pooling opportunities for small employers to obtain greater access to health coverage through HealthMarts, and for other purposes. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Education and

the Workforce, and the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. At any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2723) to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to protect consumers in managed care plans and other health coverage. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed three hours equally divided among and controlled by the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendments printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. No further amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against the amendments printed in part B of the report are waived except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. (a) In the engrossment of H.R. 2990, the Clerk shall—

(1) await the disposition of H.R. 2723;

(2) add the text of H.R. 2723, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.R. 2990;

(3) conform the title of H.R. 2990 to reflect the addition of the text of H.R. 2723 to the engrossment;

(4) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and

(5) conform provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

(b) Upon the addition of the text of H.R. 2723 to the engrossment of H.R. 2990, H.R. 2723 shall be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, today the Republican majority makes good on its promise of a full and fair debate on health care reform. We have acceded to the requests of both sponsors, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), by separating the two major issues in the managed care debate. This rule ensures that both parts of the debate, the affordable access part and the patient protection part, receive the attention they deserve separately.

Under the rule, we will first debate the access bill, H.R. 2990, introduced by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG). Because of the tax provisions within H.R. 2990, we have offered the minority a substitute, which I understand they have declined to offer, as well as the traditional motion to recommit.

The rule provides for an ample 2 hours of general debate on this access bill, to be equally divided between the three committees of jurisdiction.

After consideration of the access bill, H.R. 2990, we will proceed to separately debate H.R. 2723, the so-called Norwood-Dingell bill. We provide for 3 hours of general debate, again to be equally divided among the three committees, the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Education and Work Force, and the Committee on Ways and Means.

Because of the comprehensive nature of this legislation, the rule makes in order only full substitutes to Norwood-Dingell, the underlying bill. There are three such substitutes. Each of the three substitutes will receive an hour of debate time. We have made in order every substitute offered to the Committee on Rules, and a great many of the more than 50 or so perfecting amendments we heard in the Committee on Rules are addressed in one way or another in all of these substitutes. We believe this will ensure timely and full consideration of all points of view on this very important issue.

After considering these substitutes and voting on the underlying bill, the rule provides that the two bills, the access bill and the patient's rights bill, will be enrolled and sent to the Senate together. Since this was precisely the process that the base bill sponsors had requested, we were surprised when the minority objected last night at the last minute to this fair process and even threatened to bring down the rule over it. It should be clear to any objective Member that we have kept our word

and prevented so-called "poison pill" amendments from even being offered.

I am concerned that by last minute moving of the goalposts and by their statements in opposition to this approach, that the minority now has a desire to have a partisan political debate, rather than to solve a real and growing problem that Americans are asking us to deal with.

Access and affordability are as important as improving patient protection, and we fairly provide for both under this rule, as we have pledged we would do. At the Committee on Rules on Tuesday I was struck by something the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) said on this topic, and I quote him: "A right without enforcement is no right at all." While he was referring to the patient protection side of this debate, I believe those words are even more appropriate in the context of the debate over the uninsured.

This week the Census Bureau reported that the number of uninsured grew by 1 million last year. It is now one in six Americans that do not have health care insurance. This should be devastating news to all Americans, particularly those in the small business community. None of the important patient protections we will debate later today or tomorrow mean anything to those 44 million Americans living without insurance. In this case, to paraphrase my friend from Michigan, a right without insurance is no right at all.

That is why I am pleased that our first order of business today is a well-crafted bill to increase the number of insured, not through more bureaucracy, not "big brother" mandates, but through market reform and long overdue tax equity. For the mom and pop and other small business employees in my district in Florida, that means that they can afford quality health care insurance, they can stop using the emergency room as their only source of health care, and they can finally enjoy the same health care advantages that the employees of the IBMs of the world currently have. I will speak in greater length about the patient protection piece during the amendment process. I intend to offer a substitute, along with the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG), the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) to the Norwood-Dingell bill.

Put simply, our approach seeks to find the responsible middle ground between limited liability for health plans and a trial lawyer bonanza. Our message is simple: If you are harmed, you deserve to be made whole. But we should encourage patients to get the care they need up front from quality medical providers, with a lawsuit as a last resort, not the first choice. I am encouraged by the amount of support

we have received, and I look forward to a vigorous debate when the time comes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to finish by reminding all Members what this rule does and does not do. This rule does provide for separate votes on access and patient protection, as requested by the sponsors. This rule does not make in order any poison pill amendments intended to sink the underlying bill.

This is a fair process, and I encourage my friends on the other side of the aisle to keep their word, vote for the rule, and help us improve the quality and affordability of health care for all working Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is a classic case of caveat emptor, or perhaps it is a pig in a poke. Whatever it is, this rule is a not-too-cleverly-disguised attempt by the Republican leadership to derail meaningful reforms in the managed care industry, reforms that will benefit millions of Americans who are counting on us to help them.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has told the House that this is a fair rule, a rule which will allow the House to debate a full range of health care issues.

Mr. Speaker, I must respectfully disagree with my friend. While this rule may well allow the House to debate both managed care and a means to expand health care to some 44 million Americans who today have none, this rule is purposefully structured to keep either of those goals from being reached.

It is therefore my intention to oppose the rule. I would hope that the House will defeat this rule so that the Committee on Rules can adopt a new rule to permit the House to pass a real managed care reform package that stands a real chance of becoming law.

Mr. Speaker, clever packaging is often used to disguise the fact that consumers get much less than they pay for, and this rule is just as deceptive.

□ 1115

Thus, I must repeat that this rule is a case of caveat emptor. In this case, Members may think they are getting two for the price of one, but I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that this rule is designed to cheat those of us who are looking for real value.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority on the Committee on Rules has recommended to the House a very peculiar procedure which was never supported by the minority. This very peculiar procedure ties together two vastly different topics under the guise of a wide-ranging reform of health care in this country.

Members have to follow the bouncing ball of what they have done. After passage of both bills, presuming both pass,

the access bill and HMO reform, the rule provides that the two bills will be combined in the engrossment, thus making the two bills one, without a vote to do that. Let me repeat, after these two separate bills have been passed on separate days, then the Republicans, by operation of this rule, would tie them all together and send them to conference with the Senate, without actually voting on that proposition.

They know, they know that by doing this, this will jeopardize any piece of legislation from ever emerging from a conference with the Senate. They do so in a very cynical way.

Mr. Speaker, over and above this question about tying the two bills together without a vote to do that, the rule does not allow the House to consider an amendment which would pay for the costs associated with managed care reform. The authors of the Patients' Bill of Rights, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) have proposed an amendment to their bill which would offset the cost of higher employer deductions for worker health insurance.

Mr. Speaker, this should be a very simple proposition. Republicans have for days and days on the floor of the House been crying great crocodile tears about not wanting to invade the social security surplus. What happens? Democrats and Republicans who support this bill come to the Committee on Rules and say, make in order an amendment so we do not have to invade the social security surplus, and the Republicans say no. No, we cannot do that. We do not want to invade the social security surplus, and we say that every day four or five times here on the floor, but if you actually give us the chance to vote on that subject, we do not want to vote on it, and we will prevent the House from voting on that. That is why this is a flawed rule, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the reasoning in all of this is somewhat tortured. I do not want to belabor the House. I would only point out that last night on the subject of tying the two bills together, I asked the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), I said, why are we doing this? Why are we combining these two bills at the end without a vote? Is there some rule of the House that requires us to do that? The chairman said, no, there is not a rule of the House, we just want to do it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FROST. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. As the gentleman knows, that is the prerogative of the majority, to set forth these guidelines. But it is very

clear that if we are going to address the question that my friend has accurately raised, the fact that we have gone from 1992, when the President was elected and 38 million Americans were uninsured, to the report we just received this week, that 44.3 million Americans are uninsured, we believe very strongly that unless we provide those things that are in the access bill, that we will not be able to address the concerns of those who will become even more uninsured if we simply have the kind of legislation that the gentleman supports. That is the reason we want to tie these bills together.

Mr. FROST. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his comments, because the question I raised last night was, is there some reason, some legal reason here on the House floor that we have to do this, in the rules of the House? He said no, it is because they want to.

I would suggest that wanting to may well doom final passage out of a conference committee of either one of these provisions, which may well have merits on their own as separate pieces of legislation, but when combined under one package, no, particularly because the access bill is also not paid for. The Republicans have done nothing to provide the money to pay for the access bill. The estimates are that that bill could wind up costing \$40 billion or \$50 billion. So we are not paying for anything under the rule that is presented here today. All we are doing is voting on some very nice pieces of legislation.

Democrats are asking that the Patients' Bill of Rights that we have been advocating for years now, and it is final reaching the floor, that we be given the opportunity to offer an amendment which would pay for this bill so that the Republicans could honor their word and honor their pleas of not invading the social security trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, we have a lot of Members who wish to speak at this point. Members I know feel very strongly about passage of a strong Patients' Bill of Rights. We are to the point hopefully where we can do that, but we should do it in an honest way. We should be honest with the American public. I would urge defeat of this rule so we may have an honest procedure here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Surely the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Speaker, is not implying that we are doing anything dishonest on this side of the aisle. We have the press gallery watching. We have the whole world watching. There is nothing going on here except a clear, transparent debate on what I believe is a very good

rule, which provides for full and fair debate, which is what we have promised.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), a distinguished member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Florida, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this very fair rule. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) on all his hard work to bring people together to find some middle ground on this emotionally charged issue. It was certainly no small feat, and his success will give the House the opportunity to vote on consensus legislation that offers all the patient protections that we agree on without the excessive litigation and Federal regulation that the Norwood-Dingell bill promises.

I hope all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will give the GOSS substitute their very serious consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I find it very curious that my Democratic colleagues are opposed to this rule, which I believe is eminently fair. I think all fair-minded people will agree with me when I explain why.

The Democrat leadership and some of our Republican colleagues asked the Republican leadership to bring managed care reform legislation to the House floor for debate. Today, with the passage of this rule, we will be able to. Mind you, we are not bringing just any old managed care bill to the floor. We are taking up the bipartisan bill with so much Democrat support, the Norwood-Dingell bill. This is the base bill under this rule.

Then my Democrat colleagues ask us not to allow any poison pill amendments. We complied by making in order only full substitutes under this rule. But that was not enough. Then they asked us not to add any Republican amendments to the Norwood-Dingell bill that would provide greater affordability and access. We did not.

Now my Democratic friends are upset that we did not save them from themselves, because apparently they just realized that their bill will increase premiums. I am glad that the Democrats have come to terms with reality.

One would think that they would be pleased that this rule allows us to debate another bill that addresses affordability and access, but apparently they are still not satisfied. Now they use the politically charged rhetoric that the Norwood-Dingell bill will spend social security. It is a bit of a stretch, but I guess, in a political pinch, it will do.

So now, at the last minute, the Republican leadership is supposed to fix their policy flaws by adding a last-minute \$7 billion tax increase to the Norwood-Dingell bill? I realize we have

been accommodating, but that is just a little bit too much for us to swallow. Frankly, their protests are beginning to ring a bill hollow.

If my colleagues are truly concerned about health care policy, I suggest they support this fair rule. This rule will allow the House to debate various proposals to provide patient protections, as well as a bill that will help uninsured Americans and those that will eventually find themselves without insurance when the premium increases in the Norwood-Dingell bill price them out of the market.

Mr. Speaker, this process is eminently fair. It gives all viewpoints a chance to be heard on the important health care issues facing our Nation. I urge my colleagues to vote for the previous question and the rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, by asking us to pass a rigged rule to finally allow a vote on managed care reform, the majority has once again demonstrated that they are out of touch with the American people, and that they are even out of touch with Members of their own Republican conference.

Over 20 Republicans have signed on as cosponsors of the Bipartisan Consensus Managed Care Improvement Act because they recognize that physicians and their patients, not HMO bureaucrats, should be the ones making the decisions on what kind of care we should receive.

The rule before us is a bad rule that is designed to kill the Norwood-Dingell bill and prevent any chance of us having real, meaningful health managed care reform this year. We must defeat this rule so supporters of managed care reform on both sides of the aisle can have the opportunity to have a clean up or down vote on real managed care reform, the Norwood-Dingell bill.

This is not about providing access to care, as the opponents of the Norwood-Dingell bill would have us believe. This rule is about having no access to care even for the insured, and no managed care reform at all.

The American people have told us they want the Norwood-Dingell bill. Vote no on this rule.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE).

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I am back on the floor of the House of Congress. I have been here night after night with my colleagues from the other side and colleagues from this side of the aisle, too, in pushing that we finally get a vote on patient protection legislation.

I went before the Committee on Rules with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and argued forcefully for the amendments that concern

the Democrats on the pay-fors. I understand their concern about that. What we need, though, is we need a vote on access.

I have some concerns about some of the access provisions. I am going to speak about that. We need a vote also on patient protections. I will tell the Members what, we are going to have to run a gauntlet to get the Norwood-Dingell bill passed. The rule is tough, it is really tough, for us to win. At the end of the day, if either of those bills pass, then they go to conference.

I think this is the best we can do. I think it is time that we need to move to this debate. I understand my colleagues on the other side, their concern on this rule, but I honestly think that we can have a good debate in the next 2 days on both the access provisions and things in that access bill that can send a message to conference.

I intend to do that. I intend to work my hardest to get the bipartisan consensus managed care bill passed that will be in the best interests of the people in this country, and will help us move this process along. So I will vote for the rule, but I understand fully the concerns of Members on the other side.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican leadership has awarded this fellow in the fedora on the cover of Forbes magazines and all the tax shelter hustlers that he represents a great victory because this rule denies the right to pay for this legislation by calling on tax dodgers. As the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD), our Republican colleague, told the Rules Committee in urging an end to this tax dodging, "there is a difference between a tax increase and stopping bogus tax loopholes." Bogus loopholes, indeed. This is a bogus rule that blocks the shutdown of abusive of corporate tax loopholes.

Additionally, this rule represents fiscal irresponsibility at its worst. These bills are not paid for. It is wrong to dip into Social Security when the corporate tax dodgers should be paying for this legislation. While the costs of managed care reforms have been greatly exaggerated, all of us committed to patient protection believe this must be a fiscally prudent pay-as-you-go approach. The approach we sought in the Rules Committee was to pay for our reforms.

Finally, this so-called Republican access bill is really access to the U.S. Treasury. It would open access to up to \$50 billion of tax loopholes to be financed right out of social security. This is wrong, and the rule should be rejected.

□ 1130

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I find it a little puzzling that the gentleman who just spoke and the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) both signed a discharge petition that would have precluded the opportunity to discuss this, and now they seem to be very upset with what they signed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important the American public really gets to see how we got in the mess we find ourselves in with health care. In America today, we have a Soviet-run government-mandated health care system which has resulted in the loss of freedom of choice for millions of Americans. This rule to provide access is hopefully a step in moving back in that direction.

But I also want to make sure that the American people understand the two extremes on this debate. On one side, we have corporate America and small business who is afraid that the costs are going to go through the roof if we change anything. On the other side, we find the legal profession licking its chops to take money away from people who normally act responsibly.

We are going to hear all sorts of things during this debate. The one thing that we are going to hear claimed said many times is we are doing this for patients. We are going to find out if we are really doing this for patients, if we are really trying to restore freedom of choice, if we are really trying to restore accountability, and we are trying to do that at the same time that people do not lose their health care.

The partisanship of this body is terrible, the claims made on the basis of some premier principle when they are really a veiled partisan dig for a political purpose.

We are going to find out if one group or another really cares about people. We are going to find out on these votes if my colleagues really want to have a compromised piece of legislation that solves the problem of accountability, that restores choice and does not bankrupt the payroll of the American people who are supplying health care in this country.

We are going to get to hear all the stories that will touch our hearts that say why we should go one way. We are going to hear all the threats about why we cannot go another because health care is going to be taken away.

But in the long run, what it really comes down to is not the next election, which is what we are going to hear most about but nobody is ever going to say, what it really comes down to is will we have the courage to look and risk our seats to do what is in the best

interest of patients in this country, not what is in the best interest of the Democratic party, not what is in the best interest of the Republican Party, but what is in the best interest of the people of this country.

That rings hollow to members who have been here; I understand that. But the only true measure of whether or not we have done our job well is that when we look in the eye of somebody that is out in our district and say, You have more freedom, you still have your health care, and you are still going to get it when this debate is all over.

By the way, access is in the Senate bill. So anything we would merge is already there, and the opposition knows that. So the claim rings very hollow. Without access, no matter which bill in terms of Patients' Bill of Rights is passed, without access provisions, fewer people will have insured coverage in America tomorrow than have it today.

This access bill is not perfect. AHPs are a terrible idea when we think about what it is going to do to disrupt the private insurance market regardless of the fact that the National Federation of Independent Businesses wants it. We make no adjustment for high-risk pools in the States.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) is actually right. One cannot do AHPs unless one is willing to put something else back there to help take care of the risk.

But, politically, the bill that comes out, although needed, is not in the best interest of patients either. So let us quit playing the game of partisan politics, and let us define this debate back down about what we are really supposed to be here for is the people who need and should get care and choose, and not take it away by something we might foolishly do either for the trial lawyers or for big business.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK).

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, George W. Bush said it yesterday, that his party is putting too much emphasis on economic wealth and too little on social problems, and their candidate is not whistling Dixie.

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the previous speaker, said that we are going to break the payroll of this country. They are not going to break the payroll; they are going to break Social Security system. Because what the Republicans have done is the most dishonest, obscene attempt at almost fascist power to defeat a bill that they know would pass if they allowed the Members of the House to vote to pay for it.

To force Members to be fiscally irresponsible as a Republican ploy to win what they cannot win through honest

debate is shameful. To suggest that access is in their bill is sheer nonsense.

Thirty-two million of the 45 million uninsured are in the 15 percent bracket or less, which means they get less than the \$700 discount from a \$5,000 bill, if they had \$5,000 to buy insurance in the first place. Absolute nonsense and drivel.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this unfair and unreasonable rule, a rule so cynical, so calculated that there is no question of its intent, which is to kill the bipartisan Norwood-Dingell managed care bill.

When we went to the Committee on Rules this week, we presented an amendment version of our bill that included offsets to pay for it. That is right. We wanted to do the fiscally responsible thing and pay for what we proposed.

The Committee on Rules refused to allow us to pay for our bill. What is even more impossible to understand is the Committee on Rules will, if our bill is passed, stick on to it a \$48 billion so-called access bill that is also not paid for.

This is a disgrace. Surely the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) and his colleagues cannot suppose that the American people will be fooled by this nonsense. Just this morning the gentleman from Texas is quoted in the Washington Post as saying, "We are at a defining moment in the direction of this country. It is the classic battle of tax and spend versus balanced budget and fiscal restraint."

Ironically, the gentleman from Texas indicated that his leadership was not one to tax and spend.

I refuse to vote for this rule and this \$48 billion sound bite. If my colleagues care about balancing the budget, vote no on the rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is with real sorrow that I rise to oppose the rule on H.R. 2723, the Bipartisan Consensus Managed Care Improvement Act of 1999 of which I am a cosponsor, and proudly so, with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD).

I was initially pleased that the Republican leadership would actually schedule our bill for consideration on the floor, so it is with considerable regret that I find myself in the awkward position of opposing the rule. I do so for a number of real and valuable reasons.

First, the Committee on Rules has chosen to include a requirement to link H.R. 2990, a bill dealing with Medical Savings Accounts and other discredited insurance reforms, which I oppose and which I am certain will trigger a veto,

with H.R. 2723, a bill which would protect the rights of patients. All of the tax cuts in H.R. 2990 are unpaid for.

I would note for the benefit of my colleagues that the access provisions here, and this is the reason that they did not make these cuts subject to being identified or subject to being paid for, amount to about \$50 billion. So we cannot blame my Republican colleagues for hiding those numbers.

While the House will vote separately on each bill, the rule has determined that these two bills must be joined into a single bill when they are sent to the Senate. No reason for that except, I suspect, politics. In effect, if the first bill prevails, the rule would send the patients' rights bill to the Senate with it attached, like a kind of a ticking time bomb, and unless it is disarmed in conference, the likelihood of enacting patient protections and having them signed by the President into law is highly diminished.

I also oppose the rule because the bill sponsors were not allowed to include a package of revenue offsets, which we tried to offer in the Committee on Rules. I would like to just observe that I thought the Committee on Rules' meeting was a good one. Regrettably, it was all on the surface and not within the real discussions.

Although the revenue offsets are relatively small, about \$6 billion and less according to the Congressional Budget Office, they should be paid for so that we do not dip further into Social Security.

Similarly, none of the three substitutes for our bill are paid for. Instead, the rule waives the Budget Act for each substitute.

I have been to the floor in the past to speak of the need for patient protection legislation, but today I want to emphasize the fact that I am proud to be here with a bill that is truly bipartisan. For too long our fight on behalf of the rights of patients has been characterized as partisan. When I joined with CHARLIE NORWOOD on this bill, along with 22 Republican cosponsors, I think we put that myth to an end. We spent long hard hours reaching a compromise, but we did so because we wanted to put patients ahead of politics.

I would hope that we could defeat this rule, which is full of gimmicks and get on to helping patients. Let's feed our patients protection from their HMO, not a poison pill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN).

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and express my support for the bipartisan Dingell-Norwood bill.

Someone said in trying to defend this rule, well, it is not exactly dishonest. Well, maybe it is not dishonest; but it is clearly disingenuous, it is clearly cynical, and it is clearly raw partisanship.

It is clearly an attempt to block bipartisan legislation that will provide real HMO reform for American citizens that would give them the right to sue when they are aggrieved.

Now, this rule has two flaws. First of all, we wanted to pay for the Dingell-Norwood bill. We had the offsets. They ruled the offsets out of order, forcing us or attempting to force us to dip into the Social Security Trust Fund.

Second, they attach the access bill. It has some merits. But why is it attached? It is not paid for. It has some undesirable aspects; and it is designed, once again, for one sole purpose, and that is to help kill the bipartisan Dingell-Norwood bill.

This vote today may be the most important in our legislative session. I hope we can defeat this rule and push for real HMO reform.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I am a little bit puzzled, and I rise very strongly opposed to the rule for my puzzlement. I am going to ask the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) a question in just a moment, or the chairman of the committee.

Last week, my colleagues were criticizing we Democrats for spending Social Security Trust Funds. Last week, we had threats of advertisements being run against several of us. This week we come to the floor, and we only ask for a rule allowing all of the bills to be paid for. My colleagues deny it. Why do my colleagues choose to deny the right of this body to pay for that which we will discuss today?

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, we did not deny it. In fact, what we did is respond to the petition, the discharge petition which, in fact, would have precluded it.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time. Why would the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) at this time not go back to the Committee on Rules and give the minority an opportunity to pay for that?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. As the gentleman from Texas understands the rules of the House very well, he understands germaneness. It is not germane to do that. The gentleman signed the discharge petition in the well, I suspect, with a lot of people. If that would have moved forward, it would not have been made in order.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I did not.

Mr. DREIER. Well, I know the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) did and

several other Members. It is not germane.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), chairman of the Committee on Rules, knows that the Committee on Rules can waive germaneness at any time and often does when it is to the convenience of the majority. We are only asking that it be waived once for the minority.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it would probably be worth noting at this point in the discussion that we had a whole bunch of amendments. If we made room for one, we would have had to make room for a whole bunch more as well. We made, I think, a very wise decision to have a full fair debate. I am sorry that the folks who are upset about this, paying for what they want to do at the last minute did not think of it a lot sooner. We congratulate them for finally thinking about paying for it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG), who has been an instrumental player in this.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule; and I want to point out, as one of the original cosponsors with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT) of the access bill which provides access, affordability, and choice for the American people; that what we are hearing from the other side is that they do not like our provision, but they do not have one of their own.

There is a saying around this town, one cannot beat something with nothing. Yet, in the area of access, affordability, and choice, the other side tries to beat something that we Republicans are doing for the uninsured with nothing. My colleagues will not hear them today talk about their bill to help the uninsured get access to care.

□ 1145

Mr. Speaker, we will not hear them talk about their bill to bring down the cost of insurance and make it more affordable. We will not hear them talk about their bill to give those who are insured choice.

I want to stop at this point and talk about the second issue we will hear a lot about today, which is pay-fors. We did not pay for our bill. We cannot afford this legislation. I want to point out that the opposite is true. We simply cannot afford to go on not paying for, that is, not giving care to the uninsured in America.

We are already paying for them. Has everyone lost sight of that in this debate? The uninsured are getting care in emergency rooms all across America. The uninsured are getting care in hos-

pitals all across America, and there is cost shifting to pay for that.

So when we hear the argument that, oh, this is not paid for, this will bust the budget, please recognize that that is a ruse. That is not true because we are already paying for their care. Long ago, fortunately, this society decided that those who are in need should not go without care.

There are 44 million uninsured Americans in this country. The vast majority of those work for small businesses who cannot afford to offer them coverage. Our legislation, the legislation that the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT) and I wrote, gives those people access to care and it makes it more affordable. It gives them a deduction they do not now have. It allows small businesses to pool together.

Do not let nothing beat something. I urge my colleagues to support this very fair rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I heard my Republican colleagues talk about fairness. There is nothing fair about this rule. This is a killer rule.

Basically, what they are doing is abusing their majority position to rig the procedure here today. And I know why. Very simply, if I am a Member and I want to support the Norwood-Dingell bill, which I certainly do, I am forced under this rule basically to vote in favor of spending Social Security money. At the same time I am also forced to vote for MSAs, medical savings accounts, health marts, and all these other poison pills that basically break the insurance pool and increase the cost for the uninsured.

The Republicans say that their access bill is going to help the uninsured. Exactly the opposite; it is going to make it more difficult for people who are uninsured to buy health insurance. That is the poison pill.

They are rigging this rule. They are making it impossible for those of us who want to support managed care reform and true reform to vote for it because we would have to vote for all these awful other things that will hurt the uninsured, and make it more difficult also because of the fact that we are going to be spending Social Security money. It is unfair.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT), who will be managing the access bill.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Mr. Speaker, in the Baltimore Sun this morning appeared an article which begins as follows: "She has stood in front of the mirror trying to practice her new smile because Linda Welch-Green can't afford the dentist. She has lost three front teeth. And Bell's palsy has paralyzed the right

side of her face, so she struggles to pronounce words that start with "P." She never used to miss annual medical checkups, but now she pretends not to notice when the dates slip by. Green, 50, hasn't had health insurance for two years. Even though she's working full time as a cashier at a downtown garage, the Baltimore woman can't afford the \$200 a month to cover herself and her 13-year-old son."

Mr. Speaker, there are 44 million Linda Welch-Greens around this country whose future depends on passing the accessibility bill that this rule is going to allow us to consider today. We cannot afford not to pass this bill.

Talking about this in terms of what it is going to cost the Federal government has an air of unreality about it. These people are out there suffering. They are paying for it and we are paying for it in the illnesses that they have. We cannot afford not to pass this bill.

I am told the 5-year cost, and it is the arcane way we figure cost out here, is \$8 billion. And even the President agrees that we have well over \$100 billion over 5 years to spend on tax relief without getting into the Social Security surplus. There is no Social Security surplus issue here.

The other issue regarding linkage of this with health care reform is that health care reform does not do much good if an individual does not have health insurance. That is a linkage in common sense, not a linkage as a result of this rule. So, please, do not say that we are not doing anything for the uninsured, we are going to try to defeat the other side's attempts to do anything for the uninsured, and if the other side manages to succeed to do something for the uninsured, notwithstanding our opposition, we are going to kill the health care reform bill too.

That is not the right attitude. Let us help the Linda Welch-Greens in this country. We cannot afford not to do that. This is a good rule; it is a natural rule. Let us pass it and then pass this legislation.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I went before the Committee on Rules to try to get an answer to how the health access bill, which is just as much a tax bill as it is a health bill, how it could possibly get to the Committee on Rules without ever seeing the light of day in the tax writing committee.

I know that the Committee on Appropriations can vote on earned-income tax credits, but it has reached the point now on important legislation that the committees of jurisdiction do not even have an opportunity to review the bills. There is one thing that we have appreciated in our committee, unlike the majority on the floor, is that whether someone is a Republican or a

Democrat, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) has made certain that those bills are paid for. At least he says that he will.

Now, by any standard this bill, this package, would cost some \$43 billion over 10 years. Somebody said, well, it should not make any difference, we are paying for it anyway. Well, we can use that argument by not investing in education and transportation and research and development. There are a variety of things we can say that we are paying for it anyway. But there is no way in the world to believe that the majority is serious about health access by combining it with the Dingell-Norwood bill.

It is clear that when we have a rule like the majority has fashioned today, that for those of us who have worked so hard as Republicans and Democrats, who have tried to work together to get a decent bill, and the fact that so many Republicans have seen the light and walked away from the leadership saying they would rather have a good bill than just good will, that now the majority has done this; they have tried to think of ways just to overthrow this thing.

And what did the majority come up with? Did they give us a fair rule where we can debate the issue? No, they had to think of another bill that is unrelated and attach it and to put it in the rule. So that those of us who just want to support Dingell-Norwood would have to support a bill that has never seen our committee.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule.

Republicans and Democrats came together behind the Norwood-Dingell bill and a clear majority of this House supports it. Virtually a unanimous vote of this House supports the idea that the cost of that bill should be paid for without raiding Social Security money. Now, common sense would tell us we would, therefore, have on the floor the Norwood-Dingell bill with offsetting provisions to make sure it is paid for without touching Social Security. That is what common sense would tell us. But that is not what we are permitted to do here today, and that is what is wrong with this rule.

This rule is a conscious attempt to subvert the will of the majority. It is the tyranny of the minority. In urging my colleagues to oppose this rule, I am not certain that we are going to succeed, and perhaps the minority will succeed in having its views prevail today; but I assure my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, the majority of the American public will prevail in the end and this bill will become law despite their best efforts.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gen-

tleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), a member of the subcommittee and a very strong player in this matter.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I will do my best in the short time I have to cut through the fog that has been laid and walk through the crocodile tears that have been shed in terms of this particular rule.

Number one, the Congressional Budget Office has not scored any of these bills, so we do not have an official cost. For months, the Norwood-Dingell group said their bill did not cost anything. They are now complaining because, notwithstanding not knowing what it really costs as scored by the Congressional Budget Office, a tax provision that has never been looked at by the Ways and Means was not made in order.

Some of us on the Committee on Ways and Means have looked at that tax provision. One portion of that tax provision says that the government-forced wage rate, called Davis-Bacon, would be required to be imposed on every school district in the United States. That probably ought to go through committee so that we can determine if that is an appropriate policy or not. But they do not need to attach dollars to their bill because it has not been scored.

Secondly, when we take a look at their argument about the access provision, it is not married. Watch the vote. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) rings his hands over the problem of having to vote for access and then dealing with the patient provisions. Very simple. He will vote "no" on access, and he will vote "yes" on his choice in terms of patient protection. This rule allows that. The House will work its will.

And what about that access bill? Those tax provisions that the gentleman from New York has said he has not seen, I will have to remind him he voted "no" on all of them in committee and on the floor in terms of the comprehensive tax package.

What are some of those tax provisions on access? For the first time people who work for an employer, when the employer does not pay their health insurance, will be able to deduct the cost of that insurance. The uninsured will be covered with these access provisions. I thought that is what we were supposed to be all about.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am very sad this morning, because I am persuaded by this rule that this House will never touch insurance reform. This bill, the underlying bipartisan bill, has been doomed to fail after years of work by

large numbers of Members on both sides.

Nothing should be clearer to each of us than the fact that our constituents want medical decisions made by medical practitioners and not by their insurance carriers. But the right of action against an insurance company dooms this bill.

State after State has enacted legislation that allows the right of action this bill intends, and it has created no massive rush to the courts. Texas has had four cases in several years under this legislation. Now, if an individual lives in one of those States, then that is good for them, but they are not going to get the protection in the United States if they do not.

Now, why should insurance companies who are culpable to damages be immune from redress? Doctors are not, hospitals are not, ancillary care is not. But insurance companies have to have the immunity.

Never mind about those questions, the clever construction of this rule will once again thwart the people's will.

□ 1200

We have waited a long time for this day, only to see it lost in this dance of legislation. I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule so that we may try to have a second chance to give Americans what they want and what they deserve for the first time this year.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule. I also rise in support and plan to vote for several of the initiatives to make health care more affordable and to provide protections for patients.

It is interesting, my colleagues on the other side use a code word called "pay-fors." What the code word "pay-fors" really means is tax increase. They always want to increase taxes. That is their first choice every time.

My colleagues, there are a number of facts out here that are so important. In my home State of Illinois, 15 percent of the workers and families and people of my home State lack health insurance. It is an increase over last year. And if we look at it from a national perspective, 44 million Americans do not have health insurance. That is an increase of 1 million over last year. And the question is, why? And the answer to that question is because health care coverage is not affordable and they also do not have access.

In fact, they say that for every 1 percent increase in health care costs 400,000 Americans lose their coverage. And if we look at those 44 million Americans who do not have coverage, 85 percent of them are self-employed people or workers for small businesses unable to find affordable rates of insurance.

That is why this rule is so important, because the access in choice legislation of quality care through the uninsured legislation provides answers and solutions that have been debated over the years in this House but never signed into law. We make it easier for small businesses to go together and in a cooperative fashion purchase health insurance in greater numbers, bringing their rates down through a cooperative purchasing effort, making it more affordable, and helping their workers have health care coverage.

We give something to the self-employed that corporate America already has. We allow the self-employed under this legislation to deduct 100 percent of their health insurance premium costs. We also give uninsured workers who do not have coverage provided by their employers a 100-percent deduction for their health insurance premium costs, too. That is fair.

I was pleased that the Committee on Ways and Means in the House and Senate voted to do this earlier this year. Unfortunately, the President vetoed it.

My colleagues, let us make health care more affordable and more accessible. Vote aye on the rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the Democratic leader.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise reluctantly to ask Members to vote against this rule. This is a very important day, perhaps the most important day in the Congress that we are involved in.

We have a chance now, in a bipartisan way, to pass a very good Patients' Bill of Rights, something that I think is desired by all of the American people. I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) and many others on both sides of the aisle who have worked so hard to get to this point. They have worked together. They have worked admirably on a very tough set of issues. And what I wanted to pass this bill today.

Unfortunately the rule, in my view, is lacking in fairness, for two reasons. One, it does not allow an amendment that was desired by both Republicans and Democrats to pay for the patients. Unfortunately, the Congressional Budget Office has said that this bill will cost about \$7 billion over 5 years.

Members on both sides of the aisle wanted a chance to pay for this so that they were not seen as voting for something that would invade the Social Security Trust Fund and break the caps and causes budgetary problems. But that amendment which was desired by proponents of Dingell-Norwood was not allowed to be made.

Secondly, the access bill, which is now going to be taken up even though

we did not take it up in committee, does not have pay-fors, as well. So if it passes and becomes part of this bill, we have another section of the bill that costs money in the budget and is not paid for. I just think this is unnecessary.

First of all, the Patients' Bill of Rights should be on its own, should not be subsumed under some other bill for access which was not really the subject of this matter to begin with.

Second, if it is going to be subsumed under it, we should be allowed to figure out a way to pay for it. Thirdly, we ought to be able to pay for the Patients' Bill of Rights. None of that is allowed in the bill.

My fear is that, at the end of the day, even if Dingell-Norwood survives, the votes are not going to be there to pass the bill because of these other matters that were not dealt with properly in the rule.

I ask the majority leadership to rethink this matter and to try to get us a rule or a procedure that will allow a fair consideration of patients.

I guess I just end with saying, putting all of this procedural wrangle aside, let us all try to remember what this legislation is about. It is about helping people, children, seniors, women, men, who want to have an enforceable right to have the decisions about their health care made by the doctors and them together to be able to do that, to have an enforceable right that they can bring against their health insurance company or their HMO. That is what is at stake here.

We have a chance as a House of Representatives, in a bipartisan way, to do something that is deeply desired by the American people. I hope that this rule in its present form will be defeated, and I hope we will find a procedure and a rule that will allow fair consideration of this very, very important legislation.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what it will take for my colleagues on both sides of the House to acknowledge, as I said earlier this morning, that more than 83 percent of the American people are asking us to vote for a freestanding, upstanding HMO reform bill today. And I think one of those is little Steve Olson, a 2-year-old who went hiking with his parents. As he was hiking he fell ill, went to an emergency room, and was treated for meningitis. But the little boy still experienced pain, could not express himself. They went back to that emergency room, but they could not get any more care, they could not get him to do a brain scan because the HMO denied it. And now this little boy, because he had a lump on his brain, has cerebral palsy.

The American people are asking us to stop the parliamentary maneuvers that

would not allow us to have a free-standing bill on managed care, access to emergency rooms, the sanctity of the physician-patient relationship; and the American people are asking us to deal with the uninsured in a separate manner because there are working poor who cannot pay for their insurance and this bill does not do it. The American people have asked us to have an amendment on \$7 billion to ensure that we pay for this.

Mr. Speaker, I just conclude by saying, my colleagues, let us join together and get a real HMO reform bill, the Dingell-Norwood bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly oppose the rule for today's managed care bills. The rule is a sham and seeks to undermine these two vital health bills.

Instead of providing a fair and open rule for considering the patients' bill of rights, the majority has written an unreasonable rule that combines the managed care bill with a measure riddled with special interest "poison pills" designed to kill the measure. This rule guarantees that we will not be able to offset any potential revenue losses from the measure, and we will not be able to establish the health care services that we hoped to provide for the citizens of this country.

The majority has shown a grave error in judgment by including special interest provisions in the managed care bill. This act is fiscally irresponsible because no funding is provided for these provisions. Worse yet, this rule denies a bipartisan group of members from offering an amendment to pay for this bill.

Because the access bill and managed care bill are combined in one rule, managed care reform may be defeated through parliamentary maneuvering. This is untenable.

Merging these bills into one rule is unacceptable because it combines a bill that helps those who need health care, H.R. 2723, with a bill, H.R. 2990, that simply helps the Nation's most healthy and wealthy, and not the uninsured. We must separate these two bills so we can ensure that H.R. 2723 provides new patient protections, sets nationwide standards for health insurance, and expands medical liability. These issues are vitally important to all of the American people, not just the privileged.

Yet, these bills, these once glimmering symbols of managed care reform that sought to stretch their healing arms around each of our citizens, have now been twisted and manipulated into one hideous, unrecognizable heap of special interest slag. In particular, poison pill amendments have been offered to the Bipartisan Consensus Managed Care Improvement Act of 1999. The Boehner amendment benefits the healthy and wealthy instead of the uninsured, those who need the most help. The Goss-Coburn amendment weakens patient protections, cap non-economic damages, and guts enforcement provisions. The Houghton-Graham amendment provides far too weak federal remedies and internal review procedures.

An open rule would allow us to correct these problems. But by providing only one rule for both HMO bills, we prevent ourselves from doing any good today. Do we want to tell the

American public that it will not receive the managed care reform it has so desperately sought because of a procedural bar?

The sobering truth is that our citizens need health care reform—especially those living in poverty. Over one-third of the U.S. population was living in or near poverty in 1996. The majority of African-American (55 percent) and persons of Hispanic origin (60 percent) lived in families classified as poor or near poor. In the southern portions of the United States, the poverty rate is 15 percent. My home State of Texas had poverty rate over 16 percent. Of those suffering from poverty, 44.1 percent are uninsured. 44.4 percent of African-Americans in poverty are uninsured, and 58.7 percent of Hispanics in poverty are uninsured. These numbers are sobering, and we must do something about them.

People living in poverty, and many minority citizens, simply cannot afford health insurance, and, in turn, cannot obtain quality health care. Their lack of access to quality health care has devastating effects because many minority groups and people living in poverty are particularly susceptible to health problems. Racial and ethnic minorities constitute approximately 25 percent of the total U.S. population, yet, they account for nearly 54 percent of all AIDS cases. For men and women combined, blacks have a cancer death rate about 35 percent higher than that for whites. The age-adjusted death rate for coronary heart disease for the total population declined by 20 percent from 1987 to 1995; for blacks the overall decrease was only 13 percent.

The Bipartisan Consensus Managed Care Improvement Act of 1999 is also important due to the reforms it provides because even when people do have insurance, quality health care is not guaranteed. Take for instance, Steven Olson—a once healthy, thriving two-year old child. After falling on a stick while hiking with his parents, two-year-old Steven was rushed to the emergency room where he was treated. His mother returned him a week later because he was in great pain. He was treated for meningitis and sent home. Steven continued to complain about pain, but despite his parents' protest, the HMO doctors refused to perform a brain scan, even though it was a covered benefit. Steven eventually fell into a coma due to a brain abscess that herniated. He now has cerebral palsy. An \$800 brain scan would have prevented this tragedy.

In an even more tragic case, a woman attempted to switch doctors when it became clear that her original doctor would not fully examine a growing and discolored mole on her ankle. Paperwork and bureaucracy resulted in a six-month wait. Once the woman finally visited a second-doctor, she was immediately sent to a dermatologist who determined that the mole was a malignant melanoma. The woman died one year later.

Both sides of the aisle should be working together to ensure that these stories never surface ever again. Yet, this rule encourages special interest "gutting" of the bill, and negates any amendment that would provide the necessary \$7 billion in offsets for revenue losses estimated to result from increased deductions for higher medical premiums.

Over 200 organizations support the Bipartisan Consensus Managed Care Improvement

Act of 1999—including AIDS Action, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Heart Association, the American Medical Association, and the National Association of Public Hospitals. But these organizations cannot support the bill as offered. The special interest additions and weakened bill language undermine the goals of these groups. Without an open rule that would allow us to correct these problems, we will essentially slam the door on the very groups who can provide us with the greatest support and resources.

This rule does not penalize the minority side; it penalizes the very people we represent—the American taxpayers. We need an open rule that will permit the enactment of effective managed care reform.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" against this unfair rule and against this distorted version of the bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, just appeared on the floor and made a statement that there was a provision relating to Davis-Bacon in the amendment the Democrats sought in order.

I have consulted the Committee on Ways and Means staff. That is not true. There is nothing in the amendment that was offered by the Democrats relating to Davis-Bacon.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in yielding 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) was on the floor talking about wishing that the pay-fors were in the bill, I would like to point out that both he and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) have signed a discharge petition asking that this bill in its form that it is going to be made in order under this rule be brought directly to the floor.

In that bill, there were no pay-fors. If they would attempt to put a paid-for in as an amendment, it would be non-germane. So they have already asked by way of a discharge petition that this bill be brought to the floor without any pay-fors.

Now, regarding the pay-fors that were requested in the Committee on Rules, one of those, and the largest one of which, has never had a hearing before the Committee on Ways and Means. It is a tax increase.

As long as I have been in this Congress, both under Democrat control and under Republican control, I can never remember a single time when this Congress was so irresponsible as to bringing a tax increase directly to the floor without even so much as a hearing before the Committee on Ways and Means. That would be irresponsible on

our side, and it would be equally irresponsible on the Democrats' side.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, the American public is not going to be fooled by clever tactics. This has been a long-standing process with the Patients' Bill of Rights, and the American public is aware of that.

In the 105th session we talked about coming forward with a meaningful Patients' Bill of Rights, and that was put off by people who were carrying water for the special interests and the insurance groups.

We fought all the way through that. We found a way to build a coalition with Republicans and Democrats that were bold enough and strong enough to step forward and give real patients' rights, talking about the idea that insurance companies would be no longer the ones to determine what is medically necessary just on the basis of cost; but we would take this out of that venue and leave it to doctors and patients to decide the issue of medical necessity.

This Patients' Bill of Rights will allow people to determine if they need to go to a specialist and get that care. We have right after right in there that, finally, we have enough Republicans and almost all the Democrats on it that it will pass. And it is at that point in time that the leadership of the majority decides that they now have to get clever.

It is not enough to try to fight it on its merits. It is not enough to try to fight it on a fair rule. It is not enough to bring it forward for a straight up or down vote. Because they know now the political pressure in this country demands Patients' Bill of Rights in the form of Norwood-Dingell. They refuse to do it. They are being clever. The American public will certainly not be fooled by that.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BRYANT).

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, there are two bills, I might remind my colleagues on the floor. One bill that we will discuss later today and tomorrow will consider various ways to provide patient protection to people in America. And many of us support that.

But right now what we are talking about is a rule that also covers an access bill which we are going to debate immediately after this rule. What this access bill does is it provides an opportunity for 44 million people who do not have insurance right now who do not have anything to do with that second

bill because they do not have any insurance. They do not need protection from anything.

What we need to do now in this rule and in this bill is pass this so we can deal with those 44 million people and provide them access, the opportunity to see a doctor, go to a hospital, and get good quality care at affordable prices.

What this bill will do, it will not set up another Government entitlement; but it will provide incentives to private businesses, tax deductions, tax credits, and opportunities to pool together in areas that will be able to get them to affordable, quality, insurance coverage.

These folks do not care about this other thing right now until they get that coverage.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that we have this rule here on the floor today and hear the debate talking about the access bill that will allow 44 million people to have insurance.

We have had a Republican majority for 6 years, and it is the first time I have heard concern for that 44 million. My colleagues talk about these bills did not have a hearing in the Committee on Ways and Means at any time was a decision by the Republican leadership not to have a hearing on any of these bills.

I worked for years on the Committee on Commerce so I could deal with health care. None of the bills had hearings that we are debating today in the decision to bring them to the floor. It is becoming increasingly clear that the leadership does not reflect the views of the majority of this House on many issues.

The Republican leadership is using the Committee on Rules to defeat legislation supported by majority Members of the House and attempting to defeat by subterfuge what they cannot defeat on a straight up or down vote.

The Republican leadership cannot defeat the bipartisan Norwood-Dingell proposal, so it attempts to change the proposal so that it is unacceptable to the bipartisan Members who support a real strong Patients' Bill of Rights. That is why this rule is so wrong. That is why it should be defeated.

By denying the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) the right to finance the small portion of their legislation, the Republican leadership is trying to create a situation that they can claim that a vote for a Patients' Bill of Rights is an effort to spend the Social Security surplus.

□ 1215

That is not the intent. Hopefully, before the day is through, we will have a

chance to pass a clean Norwood-Dingell bill. It is what the people want, what 83 percent of the people in a most recent poll said. I know at all the town hall meetings that I have they say that. They want patient protections just like, Mr. Speaker, we enjoy in Texas for our constituents under Texas law. We need them for all the Americans.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that all but one of the speakers on the other side, according to my records, signed a discharge petition to bring this matter forward, the original bill, the underlying bill, to our attention, without the pay-fors in it.

I would point out that this is a procedure that is designed to end-run the committee system and point out particularly, as one looks at the discharge petition, that the first two signatures on it are the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT).

If that does not send a message that this is being done in a way to end-run the regular order and put a partisan aspect to it, I do not know what does.

The other thing I would like to point out is that we have crafted a rule that does, in fact, provide for a full debate on liability, which is the nugget of the patient protection.

We have also done something in this rule, and that is provide for worrying about those Americans who do not have health care insurance, and it is time somebody did worry about them and the Republican majority is doing that and providing a way to help them. That is worthwhile, and if anybody says that is unfair they have a warped sense of what is fair in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, we signed a discharge petition. That is the only way to get the attention of the majority. They have to be hit right between the eyes. It happens all the time around here. When we were in the majority, they signed discharge petitions. We are in the minority. We sign discharge petitions, and that was a successful effort which forced them to bring a bill to the floor they did not otherwise want to bring to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I was proud to join in signing that discharge petition because the truth is, we would not be here today had some of us not been willing to sign that discharge petition to allow this very critical issue to be brought to the floor of this House.

The truth of the matter is, even after it has become apparent to everyone in this body that a majority of the Members of this House, if given the opportunity on a straight up or down vote,

will vote for the Norwood-Dingell bill, the Committee on Rules has crafted a very complicated rule that most American people will never understand, whose sole purpose is to try to once again defeat the opportunity to pass strong patient protection legislation.

The trick they have used is to attach another bill that has a nice ring to it, a bill to provide access to health care, that just happens to have a \$40 billion to \$50 billion price tag on it, a bill that never had any hearings in the Committee on Ways and Means, attached to the Norwood-Dingell bill in the complicated rule that is before this House, simply to weigh it down and try to get some of the folks that are supporting the bill to vote no.

It is not going to work. At the end of the day, we will prevail because the American people want to see strong patient protection legislation.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, all we ask is for an opportunity to consider this legislation under a fair rule. For months and months and months the other side has decried and shed great tears about efforts to invade the Social Security trust fund. All we ask is for an honest approach to this legislation, which would permit this legislation not to take a penny out of the Social Security trust fund.

This is a good bill. Everyone agrees this is a good bill. Let us have this bill considered under a fair procedure so that we can get to the merits of the legislation. Let us not take money away from Social Security in so doing, and let us pass a strong patient protection piece of legislation.

We will oppose the rule and ask for a fair rule on this floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Goss) for the fine job that he has done on this issue.

It is not often that I stand in this well somewhat saddened over the debate that we have gone through. This is one of the first times that I can remember that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Goss) used the word "warped." Last night, he pounded on the table upstairs.

If there is any kind of unfairness, it is coming from the rhetoric that we have gotten from the other side of the aisle, using words like "cynical" and "calculated" to describe what we are doing here.

One hundred and eighty-four Members signed the discharge petition. I have to tell my friends on the other side of the aisle, that is not what it takes to force a bill to the floor.

We very much want a deal, with the fact that there are 44.3 million Americans who do not have insurance, and we want to increase accessibility for them. We also want to make sure that people are accountable when there are problems out there, and that is exactly what we are doing with the reform measure itself. We also want to make sure that affordability is out there, and that is what we are doing with this measure.

This is a very fair bill. My colleagues are screaming about one amendment on the other side of the aisle. Fifty-nine amendments were submitted to our committee. Forty-three Republicans were denied, and the Members on the other side are saying this is an unfair rule because of the six amendments the Democrats submitted, one of them was not made in order. Well, that to me is unfair rhetoric.

We are about to proceed with what I think is going to be a very fair, fair debate. In fact, we have to go back a quarter of a century, 25 years, to the debate in 1974 on the ERISA act to find a rule that is more fair.

Now a lot of people have been complaining, saying that this bill ties together the reform package and the access package. It does not do that. At the end, after the votes are taken, they are engrossed and will be sent to the other body for a conference, which we hope will address each issue.

So if someone does not want to vote for the access bill, they do not have to vote for the access bill. They can still vote for the reform bill and only after both measures pass will they be engrossed and sent to the other side of the Capitol.

So I happen to believe very strongly that we are going to begin an important debate. Everyone acknowledges that there are problems with our health care, in spite of the fact that we have the best health care system on the face of the earth. People come from all over the world to enjoy it, but there are still problems. They need to be addressed and this bill, with three balanced substitutes, will allow for an open debate, a fair debate; and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. COSTELLO. I rise today in strong opposition to the process imposed in the House today by the Republican leaders. Once again the Republican-led Congress has made in order a rule they know will defeat the bipartisan Norwood-Dingell bill, the only bill that could provide real managed care reform for 32 million Americans. This is the Republicans clever way of fooling the public into thinking they would like to pass a real managed care bill.

Mr. Speaker, the rule does not allow the bipartisan Norwood-Dingell bill to be offered in its original form and then links it with another poorly crafted bill that will deny access to the 32 million uninsured individuals in the lowest income bracket. This scheme is unacceptable, the Republican leadership should be ashamed.

The "access bill" that will be tied to the real managed care bill is for the healthiest and wealthiest of individuals. By expanding Medical Savings Account (MSAs), the access bill discourages preventive care, and undermines the very purpose of insurance. When we voted on the Kennedy-Kassebaum Health Insurance Portability Protection Act in 1996 I supported the MSA demonstration project. However, this demonstration project turned out to be a failure. Of the 750,000 policies available only 50,000 have been sold. In my own congressional district in southwestern Illinois my constituents do not have access to these policies.

This access bill and the rule is just another attempt by the Republican-led Congress to undermine a bipartisan bill that could provide relief for millions of Americans. I am outraged that the Rules Committee denied Representative DINGELL's request to offer an amendment to pay for this legislation. As a general rule the Republican leadership demands that legislation not bust the budget caps imposed in 1997. While the Norwood-Dingell bill was not expected to require additional spending, the Congressional Budget Office estimated it would cost \$7 billion. Representative DINGELL offered to offset the bill so that Members like myself who wish to protect Social Security could cast their vote in support of real managed care reform while ensuring the Social Security Trust Fund would not be touched.

As a cosponsor of the Bipartisan Consensus Managed Care Improvement Act—legislation strongly supported by doctors and by the American Medical Society and the Illinois State Medical Society—I believe it is the only real reform bill that will provide a comprehensive set of consumer rights that includes guaranteed access to emergency care and specialists, choice of providers, and strong enforcement provisions against health plans that put patients' lives in jeopardy. I am pleased the bill protects our small business owners by excluding businesses from liability if they do not make the decisions. This bill contains provisions that create safe harbors to ensure that no trial lawyer will accuse an employer of making a decision by simply choosing what benefits are in a plan or providing a patient benefit not in a plan. I am encouraged by the State of Texas who gave their citizens the right to sue HMOs for the past 2 years. In that time there have only been four cases filed.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and support real managed care reform legislation. Vote for the bipartisan Norwood-Dingell legislation.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, our day has been consumed with debate on a desperate rule drafted to derail the bipartisan managed care reform bill. This disheartens me because the Norwood-Dingell bill is a good bill. It is such a good bill; the three alternatives have used it as their base. Why is that? Maybe because over 260 medical organizations have endorsed it. Maybe because many of our constituents want us to pass it. Whatever the reasons may be, they are all for naught if this good bill has to be joined with the poison pill train that the rules committee placed on our tracks.

The Norwood-Dingell bill allows women to obtain routine ob/gyn care from their ob/gyn without prior authorizations or referral. This is a good step in the right direction. As a staunch advocate for women, I prefer women having the opportunity to designate their ob/gyn as their primary care provider but—that is another battle for another time.

Norwood-Dingell also looks out for our children. Parents now have the opportunity to select a pediatrician as a primary care provider. This provision gives parents a level of comfort knowing that their child's doctor understands the health needs of children.

Mr. Speaker, this bill needs a straight up or down vote. It should not be joined and we should not be forced to vote on both bills. When a straight up or down vote—without poison pills—is allowed, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on the Norwood-Dingell bipartisan managed care reform bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FROST moves that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 3, nays 423, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 482]

YEAS—3

Dingell	Kennedy	Obey
---------	---------	------

NAYS—423

Abercrombie	Barrett (NE)	Bishop
Ackerman	Barrett (WI)	Blagojevich
Aderholt	Bartlett	Bliley
Allen	Barton	Blumenauer
Andrews	Bass	Blunt
Archer	Bateman	Boehliert
Armey	Becerra	Boehner
Bachus	Bentsen	Bonilla
Baird	Bereuter	Bonior
Baker	Berkley	Bono
Baldacci	Berman	Borski
Baldwin	Berry	Boswell
Ballenger	Biggert	Boucher
Barcia	Billbray	Boyd
Barr	Billrakis	Brady (PA)

Brady (TX)	Gonzalez	Martinez	Sánchez	Spence	Udall (CO)
Brown (FL)	Goode	Mascara	Sanders	Spratt	Udall (NM)
Bryant	Goodlatte	Matsui	Sandlin	Stabenow	Upton
Burr	Goodling	McCarthy (MO)	Sanford	Stark	Velázquez
Burton	Gordon	McCarthy (NY)	Sawyer	Stearns	Vento
Buyer	Goss	McCollum	Saxton	Stenholm	Visclosky
Callahan	Graham	McCrery	Schaffer	Strickland	Vitter
Calvert	Granger	McDermott	Schakowsky	Stump	Walden
Camp	Green (TX)	McGovern	Scott	Stupak	Walsh
Campbell	Green (WI)	McHugh	Sensenbrenner	Sununu	Wamp
Canady	Greenwood	McInnis	Serrano	Sweeney	Waters
Cannon	Gutierrez	McIntosh	Sessions	Talent	Watkins
Capps	Gutknecht	McIntyre	Shadegg	Tancred	Watt (NC)
Capuano	Hall (OH)	McKeon	Shaw	Tanner	Watts (OK)
Cardin	Hall (TX)	McNulty	Shays	Tauscher	Waxman
Carson	Hansen	Meehan	Sherman	Tauzin	Weiner
Castle	Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)	Sherwood	Taylor (MS)	Weldon (FL)
Chabot	Hastings (WA)	Meeks (NY)	Shimkus	Taylor (NC)	Weldon (PA)
Chambliss	Hayes	Menendez	Shows	Terry	Weller
Chenoweth-Hage	Hayworth	Metcalfe	Shuster	Thomas	Wexler
Clay	Hefley	Mica	Simpson	Thompson (CA)	Weygand
Clayton	Herger	Millender-	Sisisky	Thompson (MS)	Whitfield
Clement	Hill (IN)	McDonald	Skeen	Thornberry	Wicker
Clyburn	Hill (MT)	Miller (FL)	Skelton	Thune	Wilson
Coble	Hilleary	Miller, Gary	Slaughter	Thurman	Wolf
Coburn	Hilliard	Miller, George	Smith (MI)	Tiahrt	Woolsey
Collins	Hinche	Minge	Smith (NJ)	Tierney	Wu
Combest	Hinojosa	Mink	Smith (TX)	Toomey	Wynn
Condit	Hobson	Moakley	Smith (WA)	Towns	Young (AK)
Conyers	Hoefel	Mollohan	Snyder	Trafficant	Young (FL)
Cook	Hoekstra	Moore	Souder	Turner	
Cooksey	Holden	Moran (KS)			
Costello	Holt	Moran (VA)			
Cox	Hooley	Morella			
Coyne	Horn	Murtha			
Cramer	Hostettler	Myrick			
Crane	Houghton	Nadler			
Crowley	Hoyer	Napolitano			
Cubin	Hulshof	Neal			
Cummings	Hutchinson	Nethercutt			
Cunningham	Hyde	Ney			
Danner	Inslee	Northup			
Davis (FL)	Isakson	Norwood			
Davis (IL)	Jackson (IL)	Nussle			
Davis (VA)	Jackson-Lee	Oberstar			
Deal	(TX)	Olver			
DeFazio	Jefferson	Ortiz			
DeGette	Jenkins	Ose			
DeLauro	John	Owens			
DeLay	Johnson (CT)	Oxley			
DeMint	Johnson, E. B.	Packard			
Deutsch	Johnson, Sam	Pallone			
Diaz-Balart	Jones (NC)	Pascarell			
Dickens	Jones (OH)	Pastor			
Dicks	Kanjorski	Paul			
Dixon	Kaptur	Payne			
Doggett	Kasich	Pease			
Dooley	Kelly	Pelosi			
Doolittle	Kildee	Peterson (MN)			
Doyle	Kilpatrick	Peterson (PA)			
Dreier	Kind (WI)	Petri			
Duncan	King (NY)	Phelps			
Dunn	Kingston	Pickering			
Edwards	Kleczka	Pickett			
Ehlers	Klink	Pitts			
Ehrlich	Knollenberg	Pombo			
Emerson	Kolbe	Pomeroy			
Engel	Kucinich	Porter			
English	Kuykendall	Portman			
Eshoo	LaFalce	Price (NC)			
Etheridge	LaHood	Pryce (OH)			
Evans	Lampson	Quinn			
Everett	Lantos	Radanovich			
Ewing	Largent	Rahall			
Farr	Larson	Ramstad			
Fattah	Latham	Rangel			
Filner	LaTourette	Regula			
Fletcher	Lazio	Reyes			
Foley	Leach	Reynolds			
Forbes	Lee	Riley			
Ford	Levin	Rivers			
Fossella	Lewis (CA)	Rodriguez			
Fowler	Lewis (GA)	Roemer			
Frank (MA)	Lewis (KY)	Rogan			
Franks (NJ)	Linder	Rogers			
Frelinghuysen	Lipinski	Rohrabacher			
Frost	LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen			
Galleghy	Lofgren	Rothman			
Ganske	Lowe	Roukema			
Gejdenson	Lucas (KY)	Roybal-Allard			
Gekas	Lucas (OK)	Royce			
Gephardt	Luther	Rush			
Gibbons	Maloney (CT)	Ryan (WI)			
Gilchrest	Maloney (NY)	Ryun (KS)			
Gillmor	Manzullo	Sabo			
Gilman	Markey	Salmon			

NOT VOTING—7

Brown (OH)	Istook	Wise
Delahunt	McKinney	
Hunter	Scarborough	

□ 1246

Messrs. BALLENGER, YOUNG of Alaska, COYNE, Ms. PELOSI, and Messrs. VITTER, MINGE and OWENS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2990, QUALITY CARE FOR THE UNINSURED ACT OF 1999, AND H.R. 2723, BIPARTISAN CONSENSUS MANAGED CARE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

□ 1252

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA) (during the voting). The Chair has been advised that there is difficulty with some of the votes being displayed to the Members' left, on the far left panel. There have been Members reporting that after they have cast their vote, that on the far left panel their votes are not being accurately reflected, but their votes are being properly recorded.

But Members should be cautious about what they see on the panel and